

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

BEFORE THE  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION	)	DOCKET NO.
On Its Own Motion	)	11-0354
-vs-	)	
AMEREN ILLINOIS COMPANY	)	
d/b/a Ameren Illinois (f/k/a	)	
Central Illinois Light Company	)	
d/b/a AmerenCILCO)	)	
Reconciliation of revenues	)	
collected under power procurement	)	
riders with actual costs	)	
associated with power procurement	)	
expenditures.	)	

Springfield, Illinois  
Wednesday, November 16, 2011

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

MR. LARRY JONES, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

MR. MARK W. DE MONTE  
JONES DAY  
77 West Wacker, Suite 3500  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Ph. (312) 782-3939

(Appearing via teleconference on  
behalf of Ameren Illinois  
Company)

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by  
Carla J. Boehl, Reporter  
CSR #084-002710

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 MR. JAMES V. OLIVERO  
3 Office of General Counsel  
4 Illinois Commerce Commission  
5 527 East Capitol Avenue  
6 Springfield, Illinois 62701  
7 Ph. (217) 785-3402

8 (Appearing on behalf of Staff  
9 witnesses of the Illinois  
10 Commerce Commission)

11 MS. JANIS VON QUALEN  
12 Office of General Counsel  
13 Illinois Commerce Commission  
14 527 East Capitol Avenue  
15 Springfield, Illinois 62701  
16 Ph. (217) 785-3808

17 (Appearing on behalf of Staff  
18 witnesses of the Illinois  
19 Commerce Commission)

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

1		<u>I N D E X</u>			
2					
3	<u>WITNESS</u>	<u>DIRECT</u>	<u>CROSS</u>	<u>REDIRECT</u>	<u>RECROSS</u>
4	(None)				
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13		<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
14					
15				<u>MARKED</u>	<u>ADMITTED</u>
16	(None)				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE JONES: Good morning. I will call for hearing the following three docketed matters. They are not consolidated, at least at this time. They will be heard simultaneously today for purposes of party convenience and administrative efficiency. Doing so creates no presumptions with respect to whether they will or will not be consolidated at some point.

The first is 11-0354, Illinois Commerce Commission on its own motion versus Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois, formerly known as Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO.

The next one is 11-0355, Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois, formerly known as Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS.

Lastly is 11-0356, Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois, formerly known as Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP.

All are reconciliations of revenues

1 collected under power procurement riders with actual  
2 costs associated with power procurement expenditures.

3 At this time we will take the  
4 appearances orally for the record, first on behalf of  
5 Ameren Illinois Company.

6 MR. DE MONTE: Your Honor, this is Mark  
7 DeMonte, D-E-M-O-N-T-E, on behalf of the company --  
8 or the companies in all three dockets. My business  
9 address is 77 West Wacker, Suite 3500, Chicago,  
10 Illinois 60601. I am with the law firm of Jones Day,  
11 and my telephone number is (312) 782-3939.

12 JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

13 Commission Staff?

14 MR. OLIVERO: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 Appearing on behalf of the Staff  
16 witnesses of the Illinois Commerce Commission, Janis  
17 Von Qualen and Jim Olivero, 527 East Capitol Avenue,  
18 Springfield, Illinois 62704, and our numbers are 217  
19 area code 785-3808 and 785-3402.

20 JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

21 Are there any other appearances?

22 (No response.)

1                   Let the record show there are not.

2                   First off, have the parties given any  
3           consideration at this point as to whether these  
4           matters should or should not be consolidated?

5           MR. DE MONTE: Your Honor, we have not talked  
6           with Staff counsel in that regard, but we certainly  
7           could do so.

8           MR. OLIVERO: Mark, if you want to consolidate,  
9           then we would have no objection to that.

10          MR. DE MONTE: I would just -- I would need to  
11          talk with some folks just to confirm what our  
12          position would be on that, but. So if there wasn't a  
13          need to address consolidation at this time, I would  
14          ask if we could take it up maybe at the next status  
15          conference.

16          JUDGE JONES: Is that satisfactory to Staff?

17          MR. OLIVERO: That's fine.

18          MR. DE MONTE: Thank you, everyone.

19          JUDGE JONES: All right. So consolidation will  
20          not be further addressed at today's prehearing  
21          conference. It is a candidate for being revisited at  
22          the next status hearing or prior thereto.

1                   Is there some scheduling to be  
2   proposed for the record?

3           MR. DE MONTE: Your Honor, this is Mark  
4   DeMonte. I have spoken with Staff counsel with  
5   respect to the following testimony, and we would like  
6   to present to you an agreed schedule whereby the  
7   Companies would file their direct testimony on  
8   February 8, 2012, and would ask Your Honor if we  
9   could hold a status conference on or around February  
10  29 at a time convenient for you.

11          JUDGE JONES: All right. Did Staff want to  
12  file testimony prior to the status on the 29th?

13          MR. OLIVERO: I am sorry, Your Honor?

14          JUDGE JONES: Does Staff want to file testimony  
15  prior to that status on the 29th?

16          MR. OLIVERO: No, Your Honor.

17          JUDGE JONES: To move this process along?

18          MR. OLIVERO: No.

19          JUDGE JONES: Is 10:00 a.m. an acceptable time  
20  for the status on February 29?

21          MR. DE MONTE: It is for me, Your Honor.

22          MR. OLIVERO: Yes.

1           JUDGE JONES: All right. Let the record show  
2           that that scheduling that had been proposed for the  
3           record is acceptable. There will be a status hearing  
4           on February 29 at 10:00 a.m. Participation by  
5           telephone will be permitted at that time.

6                       As noted, that will be preceded by a  
7           date for filing of Company direct testimony on  
8           February 8.

9                       I believe that may cover the bases  
10          today. Let me check. Do the parties have anything  
11          else they wish to take up today on or off the record  
12          before we conclude these prehearing conferences?

13          MR. OLIVERO: Well, I was just going to say, if  
14          Ameren in fact wanted to file a Motion to Consolidate  
15          prior to the time that they had their testimony due  
16          so that they were filing only one set, I guess, of  
17          testimony, I presume that would be all right with  
18          Mark.

19          MR. DE MONTE: That was what I had in mind as  
20          well.

21          MR. OLIVERO: I mean in advance of the next  
22          status that we talked about, so.



1 JUDGE JONES: So are you suggesting that, if  
2 the Company wants the cases consolidated, that it  
3 would be acceptable to Staff that they could simply  
4 make one testimony filing on February 8 if that were  
5 accompanied by a Motion to Consolidate or if there  
6 were some Motion to Consolidate prior to -- filed  
7 prior to that?

8 MR. OLIVERO: Right. That's correct, Your  
9 Honor.

10 JUDGE JONES: Is that process okay with you,  
11 Mr. DeMonte?

12 MR. DE MONTE: It sounds like -- yes, Your  
13 Honor, and I appreciate the flexibility of everyone  
14 involved.

15 JUDGE JONES: Okay, thank you.

16 Anything else for the record?

17 (No response.)

18 All right. Let the record show that  
19 today's prehearing conference is concluded. In  
20 accordance with the above, this matter is continued  
21 to a status hearing date on February 29, 2012, at the  
22 hour of 10:00 a.m.

1 (Whereupon the hearing in this  
2 matter was continued until  
3 February 29, 2012, at 10:00 a.m.  
4 in Springfield, Illinois.)  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22